



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	14/06
2. Advertiser	Tricon Restaurants International (KFC - Swing King Backyard bucket)
3. Product	Restaurants
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 February 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement depicts a mother carrying KFC Backyard Bucket to her family playing backyard cricket. Dad extracts free Swing King ball from the bucket and bowls to daughter who heads the ball back towards Dad, unfortunately hitting him in the genitals. Dad is depicted bending over in pain trying to appear calm and announces "That's tea". A shot of the items in the "Backyard Bucket" and the free "Swing King" ball are shown. Family returns to cricket while Dad remains at the table still eating. One of the children plays another ball which hits Dad on the head.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*This sends an appalling message to children that such events are a joke...a continuation of the phenomenon of making men look stupid.*

*Would they portray a woman being hit in the genitalia or breasts and being in such pain they can hardly speak.*

*Such ads debase the "family" spirit of cricket because it converts people with humanity into objects of subtle ridicule and devaluation.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

*This is a humorous TVC highlighting the fact that Dad's in general are famous for having an inflated opinion of their sporting ability.*

*The consumer is left wondering exactly where the ball has connected however there is no doubt that Dad has been humbled.*

*We believe this to be a very funny and light hearted approach which captures a typical Australian insight. Feedback from consumers has suggested that they empathise with this scenario and appreciate the fact that this is a situation we can all relate to.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board ("Board") considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board considered whether the violence in this advertisement was justifiable in the context of the

product advertised eg: take away food. The Board did not consider that the accident portrayed in the advertisement was unjustified in the context of backyard cricket where such accidents often occur. The Board did not consider that the advertisement discriminated against men by showing the father as the butt of the joke or accident.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.